

# ISSUES & EVENTS

October 22, 1970, Volume 2, number 6

■ Financial statements, page 2

■ Financial Highlights, page 3

The writer, who was previously a member of the Religious Studies Department at Haverford College in Pennsylvania, is the new Chairman of Religion at Sir George Williams. Below, excerpts of Prof. Slater's paper to be presented at the annual meeting of the American Academy of Religion on Friday, October 23 in New York.

I want to consider the problem of integrity in a program of religious studies. For many of us, the initial identity crises are over. Our departments are a recognized feature of the academic landscape. We have proved our independence of our boards of managers by failing to inculcate faith and morals in the young.

We are respectable in the secular world. But in the process we have come close to losing our souls. Our courses are so cluttered with Camus and Cleaver, Marcuse and Norman Brown, that we would be hard pressed to guess what department's selections we were looking at, were we to see our required readings stacked up along the bookstore walls. We are typical adolescents -- self-assertive yet unsure of our-selves, obsessed with how we look to our peers, growing in the power to be ourselves, but *without discipline*. No wonder the Sophomores love us! It is time that we came of age.

For most of us, the parental discipline against which we have been rebelling is that of theology.

We have awakened from our sectarian slumbers to discover a fascinating land of myth and folklore outside the seminary walls. And we have realized how much of what we learned within comes under the same headings of myth and folklore and have recognized as religion the vast range of rituals and commitments that was not comprehended in our theology.

The big shift has been in the direction of social studies. We have discovered "civil religion in America". We have discerned the priestly roles of politicians, psychiatrists, PR men and newspaper pundits. We have thrilled at the thought that the propagandists of the New Left may be the prophets of our time. But so far, our looking has tended to have no more system to it than that of an annual stock-taking. We have classified what's on the shelves in the manner of an American van der Leeuw. But now that we have gathered all that data, what are we to do with it?

The pioneers in our departments were mostly brought up on the principle of "Data for data's sake." They were so afraid of exhibiting any kind of theological commitment -- or so fed up with the heresy hunts of theologians -- that they simply laid out one world religion after another before the awestruck students, without any suggestion of right or wrong beliefs. Inevitably, the students chose up sides, being either fascinated

with things foreign or reconfirmed in their prior convictions. But they were not taught any principles of criticism to guide them in their choices. Even today we fail to teach our students the art of assessing commitments as an academic exercise, though most of us believe that a man without commitments is only half a man.

Without belittling the achievements of our predecessors or sliding back into the parochialism of the seminaries, we need now to develop some sense of the principles and purposes governing the study of religion in universities and colleges, if we are to integrate our data into the Liberal Arts' curriculum. The rest of this essay is meant to open discussion of this issue. I focus on the concept of an undergraduate Major in Religion as the point at which our problems become most obvious and acute.

All too often, it seems to me, Religion at the undergraduate level continues to represent a conglomerate of interests rather than an initiation into critical thinking on a given subject. If our seniors have gained some sense of discipline, it has generally come from their cognate courses in related fields. Otherwise, they have become alive to questions, perhaps, but hardly equipped to sort out the possible answers in any methodical way.

We could rationalize the current situation on many of our campuses by arguing that the concept of an academic discipline is obsolete. But I am less interested in such labels as 'discipline' and 'field' than in the difference between a trained intellect and an untrained one. In particular, I am concerned with what it means to say that one has concentrated on the study of religion and whether such a study constitutes a discipline in its own right.

For I believe that we have in hand the makings of an exciting new subject with a "logic" and set of interests of its own.

What, then, is religion and the study of religion? Tillich's rough definition is as useful a beginning as any: religion is that which concerns me ultimately (das mich unbedingt angeht). It allows for the social scientist's recognition that what actually concerns me isn't always what I admit to being concerned with and the existentialist's insistence on the "for me" element in religion. Some have said that the definition is too little receptive to the idea that religion is what God demands of us and too enamored of the idea that it is merely the projection of my dreams and nightmares. Tillich was too big a man to be purely egotistical, either in life or in thought.

What is lacking in Tillich's shorthand definition is some recognition of the social shape that our concerns have taken in the past and of the place that we give to our lesser concerns in the light of our ultimate concern. For example, we have not studied Brahmanism if we confine our researches to the last of the four "goals" in life and leave out sex and politics. (One look at the temple walls in India is enough to discredit any idea of such an omission!) We need to consider not only the peak experiences in the history

## RELIGION AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE PETER SLATER



of religions but also the ways in which interpretations of these have percolated down to affect the conduct of daily life. We need to acknowledge where religion shades off into other affairs as well as what brings them all into focus.

What Tillich's definition does do for us, however, is to set our eyes firmly on the fact that, whatever else, religion brings up the question of priorities. We may gather what these priorities are, and so obtain some idea of what subjects should be encountered in courses on religion, if we elaborate somewhat on Tillich's definition. I offer the following: *a religion is a personal way of life informed by traditional elements of creed, code and cult and directed towards the realization of some transcendent end-state (e.g. Nirvana or Olympian Bliss).*

It is the reference to transcendence that makes of religion more than a recollection of past glories. Appeal to our ultimate end is what gives the prophet his principle of criticism against the priestly tradition. I can share the attitudes and intentions of Isaiah, for instance, long after men have ceased thinking in terms of cherubim in the holy of holies. From my nurture in his tradition, I come to appreciate what concerned him ultimately and so to express this same ultimate concern in my own day and age.

By "personal way of life" I mean both individual and communal ways. In this connection, it is noteworthy that most of us are adherents of more than one religion or quasi-religion. It is a rare man whose commitments constitute a consistent set and whose practice matches his promises. Many a lapsed son of Israel, for instance, still celebrates his son's Bar Mitzvah and many an erstwhile Catholic or Protestant gets married in a church. It is a disciplined spirit indeed that subdues all yearnings for utopia, all symptoms of hero-worship and all inclinations to hedge one's bets by worshipping at the altar of more than one "god". Now that we have taken off our sectarian spectacles, we are beginning to see "religion" again in all its forms and sacred places, in "the hunt" at work as well as in the bridal chamber at home. And we are beginning to appreciate the relevance of the study of religion to the conduct of life in the twentieth century.

It follows from what I have said that the study of religion includes not only the history of the formation of various creeds, but also the comparative study of codes and cults. It encompasses the "high" traditions of the major world



# FINANCIAL STATEMENTS | 5.31.70

## SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY BALANCE SHEET AS AT MAY 31, 1970 (with comparative figures for 1969) (Note 1)

ASSETS			LIABILITIES		
	1970	1969		1970	1969
Cash (Note 2)	\$ 563,448	\$ 321,408	Bank indebtedness	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 1,550,000
Marketable securities at cost (market value 1970 \$30,203 - 1969 \$21,600)	36,875	26,912	Accounts payable and accrued liabilities (Note 5)	833,324	1,825,951
Accounts receivable (Note 3)	949,707	973,448	Mortgage payable, 7% to mature at June 15, 1970	17,225	17,225
Inventories at the lower of cost and net realizable value	310,432	490,020	Funds held in trust	251,417	223,478
Prepaid expenses	91,213	83,156	Unearned tuition fees	582,447	583,770
Insurance claims	69,177	1,234,334	Unexpended research grants	252,453	186,507
Land, buildings, equipment and improvements, at cost (Note 4)	30,998,113	30,001,216		4,036,866	4,386,931
Unamortized bond issue expenses		41,975	7 1/4 % Series "A" Mortgage bonds to mature at \$110,000 per annum until October 15, 1978 (Note 2)	990,000	1,100,000
			UNIVERSITY EQUITY		
			Operating funds	(273,101)	(334,439)
			Capital funds	28,265,200	28,019,977
	<u>\$33,018,965</u>	<u>\$33,172,469</u>		<u>\$33,018,965</u>	<u>\$33,172,469</u>

The notes are an integral part of these financial statements

## SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY STATEMENT OF DEFICIT FOR THE YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1970 (with comparative figures for 1969) (Note 1)

	1970	1969
Deficit (retained income), June 1	\$ 334,439	(\$ 16,718)
Excess of expense over revenue for the year	155,736	351,157
	490,175	334,439
Extraordinary item: Insurance recovery of 1968/69 special administration expenses	217,074	
	<u>\$ 273,101</u>	<u>\$ 334,439</u>

The notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

## SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY STATEMENT OF CAPITAL FOR THE YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1970 (with comparative figures for 1969) (Note 1)

	1970	1969
Balance, June 1	\$28,019,977	\$23,928,533
Add: Provincial government capital grants	110,000	3,565,000
University building fund campaign receipts	110,535	399,612
University property fund	39,275	109,567
Other	28,201	17,265
	28,307,988	28,019,977
Less: Bond discount and other related charges	42,788	
	<u>\$28,265,200</u>	<u>\$28,019,977</u>

The notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

## SIR GEORGE WILLIAMS UNIVERSITY STATEMENT OF REVENUE AND EXPENSE FOR THE YEAR ENDED MAY 31, 1970 (with comparative figures for 1969) (Note 1)

REVENUE			EXPENSE		
	1970	1969		1970	1969
University			University		
Tuition fees	\$ 5,259,521	\$ 5,134,699	Academic	\$ 7,658,867	\$ 6,666,730
Province of Quebec operating grants	7,730,924	6,072,090	Library	1,345,416	1,244,950
Miscellaneous fees	540,896	519,135	Registrar	456,934	450,816
Interest	76,318	58,005	Computer centre	540,686	273,633
Donations	2,337	5,761		10,001,903	8,636,129
Other	110,220	90,415			
	13,720,216	11,880,105	Administration	995,711	1,284,046
Scholarships	31,840	24,973	Physical plant	2,207,349	1,857,068
Assisted research Grants	323,066	192,687	Student services	541,142	489,718
Total university and research revenue	14,075,122	12,097,765		13,746,105	12,266,961
Schools			Scholarships	31,840	24,973
Tuition fees	420,463	489,179	Assisted research	323,066	192,687
Donations	1,915	7,235			
	422,378	496,414	Total university and research expense	14,101,011	12,484,621
Auxiliary Services			Schools		
Bookstore	786,850	790,611	Academic and administration	436,886	448,647
Food service	707,620	608,323			
Printing and reproduction services	227,363	-	Auxiliary Services		
	1,721,833	1,398,934	Bookstore	860,970	801,828
Total Revenue	16,219,333	13,993,113	Food service	736,026	609,174
Excess of expense over revenue for the year	155,736	351,157	Printing and reproduction services	240,176	
	<u>\$16,375,069</u>	<u>\$14,344,270</u>		1,837,172	1,411,002
				<u>\$16,375,069</u>	<u>\$14,344,270</u>

The notes are an integral part of these financial statements.

## auditors' report

Sir George Williams University.

We have examined the balance sheet of Sir George Williams University as at May 31, 1970 and the statements of revenue and expense, deficit and capital for the year then ended. Our examination included a general review of the accounting procedures and such tests of accounting records and other supporting evidence as we considered necessary in the circumstances. As is the case in most organizations in receipt of funds by donation, verification of such items was impracticable beyond accounting for amounts recorded in the books of the University.

In our opinion these financial statements present fairly the financial position of the University as at May 31, 1970 and the results of its operations for the year then ended in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles applied on a basis consistent with that of the preceding year.

TOUCHE ROSS & CO.,  
CHARTERED ACCOUNTANTS.

MONTREAL, QUE.  
SEPTEMBER 8, 1970.

(Except for Note 6 for which the date is October 5, 1970)

## notes to financial statements

### 1. COMPARATIVE INFORMATION

To conform to presentation adopted in 1970, the 1969 figures included herein have been reclassified.

### 2. CASH AND BOND ISSUE

On October 15, 1968, the University issued \$1,100,000 7 1/4 % First Mortgage Series "A" Bonds, secured by a first charge on the Henry F. Hall Building and contents. These bonds and the related interest are to be repaid out of monies voted yearly by the legislature of the Province of Quebec. Included in cash at May 31, 1970 is an amount of \$140,342 (1969 \$263,321) being the unexpended balance of the proceeds of the bond issue; these funds which are held by the trustee can be used only for capital additions.

### 3. ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE

The detail of the Accounts Receivable is as follows:

	1970	1969
Tuition fees	\$514,503	\$592,134
Province of Quebec Grant	98,000	59,000
Young Men's Christian Association	50,753	110,269
Other	286,451	212,045
	<u>\$949,707</u>	<u>\$973,448</u>

### 4. LAND, BUILDINGS, EQUIPMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS

The detail of fixed assets is as follows:

	1970	1969
Land	\$ 4,248,773	\$ 4,169,530
Buildings	19,445,518	19,313,533
Furniture and equipment	6,448,317	5,988,212
Leasehold improvements	571,319	430,416
Property renovations	284,186	99,525
	<u>\$30,998,113</u>	<u>\$30,001,216</u>

No depreciation has been provided in the accounts for the year ended May 31, 1970.

Included in fixed assets are properties having an approximate cost at May 31, 1970 of \$1,100,000 acquired for future expansion of the University and currently not used for University purposes.

### 5. ACCOUNTS PAYABLE AND ACCRUED LIABILITIES

The detail of accounts payable and accrued liabilities is as follows:

	1970	1969
Operating fund	\$781,772	\$1,638,461
Capital fund	51,552	187,490
	<u>\$833,324</u>	<u>\$1,825,951</u>

### 6. CAPITAL GRANT AND BOND ISSUE

On July 15, 1970 the University issued \$1,000,000 9 1/2 % First Mortgage Series "B" Bonds, the proceeds of which are to be used to finance capital expenditures authorized for the year ended May 31, 1970. The bonds are to be repaid at \$25,000 per annum from July 15, 1971 - 1977 inclusive and the balance of \$825,000 on July 15, 1978 out of monies voted yearly by the legislature of the Province of Quebec.

The University has been advised that of the computer insurance proceeds, \$635,000 is to be applied to the University's capital grant for the 1970/71 fiscal year. As these funds were received in the 1969/70 fiscal year, capital expenditures of 1970/71 will be made to that extent without further reimbursement.

### 7. CAPITAL COMMITMENTS

As at May 31, 1970 the University had undertaken to purchase property for an amount of \$275,000.



religions and the "low" traditions of the less sophisticated. The scholar in Religion knows how to distinguish the true from the false amongst priests and prophets, even as he shares in a culture that leans rather on columnists and professors. He appreciates the contexts in which they came to their decisions and made their compromises. And he masters the principles whereby they distinguished between hypocrisy and good politics. He uses all the aids to investigation available to man in the secular world while appreciating that secularity is not the whole story. It is this scholar whose intellectual heirs we have to train.

If, now, we look at college programs in Religion with these definitions and observations in mind, we may see why much of the material that is there belongs there and how we may bring some discipline into our discussions of the data. Obviously, many students still need to be given an expanded consciousness of the religious phenomena in our culture. They must become sensitive to the religious dimensions of life exemplified in "secular" literature as well as in scripture, alert to the paganism of today as well as of yesterday. To initiate them into this kind of awareness is, I think, the task of a good introductory course.

But it is not much use talking to students about the "paganism" of today if they have no knowledge of the major forms of religious experience and expression in the past. They must learn to put their own tacit traditions in their historical contexts, seeing the Bible against the background of the Ancient Near East, setting Christian theology in the milieu of Hellenistic culture. In this connection, I maintain that every major in Religion should know some set of scriptures -- the Bible, the Qur'an, the Veda, the Tripitaka or the Confucian Canon -- and the history of its interpretation. He should know why these and not other writings were chosen for their communities and what it means to reflect systematically and how to argue by appeal to the tradition for conclusions other than those of the orthodox. Unless he is engaged in a program of interdisciplinary studies he should, ideally, gain some sense of the original languages and know more than one set of scriptures or stream of oral tradition. He must know why "pure" reason has not always been given highest priority in the deliberations of men. In short, he must learn to respect authority -- when it is appropriate to do so.

A graduate in Religion should be one who can systematically tease out our hidden allegiances by comparing various ways of life with each other -- ways in which similar values are

# RELIGION AS AN ACADEMIC DISCIPLINE



weighted differently and conflicting goals are given highest priority. He should be like the philosopher in depending upon data supplied by others and like the historian in poring over the actual decisions of individuals and communities. But he should have his own distinctive training and sense of discipline, gained not from any single course required in his last semester but from the way in which all his classes in Religion have been conducted from beginning to end. I believe that the end for which we all strive in religion is some kind of freedom. The study of religion is for me the study of man's quest to be free, in and of himself, from and for the world. Of course, the ways to freedom are as various as our conceptions of it, including complete alienation from things physical and utter absorption in mundane matters. We many think of freedom in primarily political terms, primarily personal terms or as some composite of these. Here again we must recall that religious ways of life shade off into non-religious ways of life as our ultimate concern blends in with our intermediate concerns.

What gives integrity to our religion is, in any case, not its restriction to a limited segment of our culture by reference to the ideal end espoused in our tradition. Likewise, what gives integrity to the study of religion is not attention to a limited set of cultural artefacts but recognition of the colouring of the whole range of our commitments by a particular quest for freedom. In this context, we

may note that, while we cannot and should not attempt to make our students' commitments for them, we should teach them to recognize commitments that have been made and to deal with them in their own terms.

A major in Religion should, accordingly, be one who has mastered the many traditions and is prepared to make his own way to freedom. In Wittgenstein's sense, he knows how to "go on" using such central concepts as alienation and freedom, sin and salvation, by extrapolating and applying them to novel conditions. He can discern the sense of identity conveyed by modern myths and distinguish between the authentic and unauthentic rituals that regulate the social traffic of our times. He can appraise not only the theoretical intricacies of our value-judgments, as would a moral philosopher, but also the practical impediments to the ends in view. He is alive to obstructive and constructive resorts to tradition. He can contribute to new creeds in the making and cross-examination of old codes in the light of modern concepts of human nature.

He resists claims to ultimacy made for any discipline, including his own, because he recognizes the relativity of our achievements in view of our transcendent ends. Throughout, his mind is not tied to any single doctrine of God or dream of life after death. Rather he knows what would count as a Gnostic, a Catholic, a bhakti or karma yoga way of living under new conditions. He knows and is ready to make an informed choice for himself, even if he does not choose to follow any tradition personally. And that is all that we should expect from the product of an academy that does not promise salvation to its graduates. As we all know, to be educated in religion is not necessarily to be religious.

How, then, are we to turn this dream student into a reality? No one component of the undergraduate program is sufficient. What has to be insisted upon, rather, is some meaningful sequence of courses and requirements which develops a cumulative impulse in the desired direction. Whether a student concentrates upon biblical studies, non-western studies, social studies or contemporary thought, he must develop the sense of subject, linguistic skills and control of data that mark the scholar off from the pedant. He must come to his senior seminars ready to undertake truly demanding examinations of religious life and thought, or find himself refused admission.

Obviously, in three or four years, a student cannot be expected to become familiar with every feature of religion. I consider it sufficient if he has followed any two sub-fields through the intermediate steps to the advanced seminars -- or any one, taken in conjunction with a minor in another subject. He deserves his degree when he realizes how much he doesn't know yet know where to look for the information that he is lacking and what to ask those who do know. Given an overview of the whole subject, intensive training in some facets of it and time to practice his skills in his senior year, he comes out as much more than just a carbon copy of ourselves. For he evolves from a whole new era in the study of religion.

## SGW: FISCAL HIGHLIGHTS

The deficit on university operations for the year ending May 31, 1970 was \$25,889, or less than 0.2% in a budget of \$13,700,000. Commenting on the report and financial statements now published, Bill Reay, the Treasurer, remarked that this is about as close as one can come to breaking even.

The total SGW deficit was \$155,736, since there

was also a deficit of \$14,508 on school operations and of \$115,339 on auxiliary operations, largely the result of bookstore losses.

The deficit has been offset by application of part of the insurance money which was received this year to meet special administrative expenses actually incurred in 1968-69. These expenses amounted to \$217,074. As a result the

continuing deficit of the University was reduced to \$273,101, compared to \$334,439 a year previously. We have, Mr. Reay pointed out, no endowment funds that we can apply to our deficit, as opposed to McGill and many other universities. Administrative expenses show a marked reduction in 1970.

The financial effects of the events of February 11, 1969 can also be traced in other figures. For instance, a heavy "Accounts Payable" item in the 1969 balance sheet reflects a delay in meeting our bills due to a loss of computer capacity; the relationship of bank indebtedness to accounts payable for 1970 is the more normal. Also, the increase in Computer Centre costs reflects the fact that we are now renting our major equipment.

The statement of capital shows a reduction in the provincial capital grant from \$3,565,000 in 1969 to \$110,000 in 1970. The money received in 1969 included a final payment on the grant

for the Hall Building. Also, Mr. Reay points out, capital funds are now being raised by the universities in Quebec through bond issues, as referred to in Note 2 of Notes to Financial Statements.

Commenting on the figures in Note 4, Mr. Reay remarked that the University now holds property around the Hall Building worth about two million dollars, of which half is being used by the University and half is at present rented. About half of this real estate is owned outright as a result of donations to the University, and half is covered by bank loans. The land is essential for any major expansion of SGWU.

Commenting on the statement of revenue and expense, Mr. Reay noted a rise in assisted research grants of nearly 70% - from \$192,687 to \$323,066. Such grants come primarily from the National Research Council and Canada Council. The increase is impressive, though the total is still modest compared with longer established universities.



Send notices and photos of coming events to the information office, room 211 of the Norris Building, or phone 879-2867. Deadline for submission is noon **Wednesday** for events the following Thursday through Wednesday.

# SGWU / THIS WEEK



Left, "On the Market Square, St. Miguel", part of the Andre Bieler exhibition on view in the Weissman Gallery and Gallery 1 through Nov. 7. Right, John Max's "Untitled March 1963" photograph of the National Gallery's visiting exhibition through Nov. 7.



## thursday 22

**GARNET KEY SOCIETY:** Nominations are now open. Deadlines for submitting nominations November 7, 1970. Application forms may be obtained from the receptionist of the SA office, the office of the Dean of Students, the main information desk in the Hall Building, the Records office or the Garnet Key office in H-340. Additional information may be obtained by contacting Stan Martin at 879-4520 or Dave Ramsay at 879-5983.

**CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART:** Winners of Canadian Film Awards competition 1970. "Multiplicity." (Vincent Vaitiekunas), "KW+" (Aimée Danis) and "A little Fellow from Gambo" (Julian Biggs) at 7 p.m.; "Psychocratie" (Bretislav Pojar) and "The Neon Palace" (Peter Rowe) at 9 p.m. in H-110; 50c for students, 75c non-students.

**FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV:** Channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

**WIESSMAN GALLERY and GALLERY I:** "André Bieler: 50 years" - 66 works spanning the 72 year old artist's career, through November 7, 11 a.m. - 9 p.m. Monday through Friday, 11 a.m. - 5 p.m. Saturday.

**GALLERY II:** National Gallery's "The Photograph as Object" through November 7.

**BIOLOGY CLUB:** Meeting at 1 p.m. in H-420.

## friday 23

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL:** Meeting at 2 p.m. in H-769.

**HISTORY SOCIETY:** Meeting at 2:30 p.m. in H-420.

**E.S.A. FILM:** "The Magus" with Anthony Quinn at 8:30 p.m. in H-110; 99c

## saturday 24

**E.S.A. FILM:** "I Love You, Alice B. Toklas" with Peter Sellers and Leigh Taylor-Young at 8:30 p.m. in H-110; 99c

**FOOTBALL:** Sir George vs MacDonald, 2 p.m. at MacDonald.

**SOCCER:** Sir George vs Clinton College, 2 p.m. in Plattsburg.

## monday 26

**GARNET SINGERS:** Meeting 5-6 p.m. in H-513; everyone welcome.

**S.G.W.U. RIDING CLUB:** Meeting at 5 p.m. in the Athletics office. 2160 Bishop; please leave you horse outside.

**HILLEL:** Prof. Jonathan Siegal talks on the Dead Sea Scrolls, 8 p.m. at 2130 Bishop.

**WITHDRAWALS:** Last day for academic withdrawal from first term half courses.

## tuesday 27

**SCIENCE STUDENTS ASSOCIATION:** Beer bash at the "Moustache" opposite Forum, at 8 p.m.; 3 tickets \$1.

**HILLEL:** Group sensitivity with Dan Daniels, 7:30 p.m. at 3460 Stanley.

**WORKING WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION OF S.G.W.U.:** Meeting at noon in H-615.

**FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV:** Cable TV's channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

## wednesday 28

**STATISTICS AND OPERATION RESEARCH SOCIETY:** Dr. D.A. Wilson, director of Statistics and Economic Research at Canadian Pulp and Paper, will discuss "The Uses of Statistics in the Pulp and Paper Industry" at 2:30 p.m. in H-1023.

**UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON STUDENT LIFE:** Meeting at 5:15 p.m. in H-769.

**HILLEL:** NYU ecologist Murray Bookchin on "Utopia or Oblivion," 2 p.m. in H-435.

**SOCIETY FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF MANAGEMENT:** Dinner at Bucharest Steak House (Stanley at de Maisonneuve) at 6 p.m. The guest speaker will be Mr. Garneau from the Montreal Personnel Association; \$2.50 for members; \$3 for non-members and \$4 for non-students.

## thursday 29

**CONSERVATORY OF CINEMATOGRAPHIC ART:** "A nous la Liberté" (René Clair, 1932) at 7 p.m.; "Young Aphrodite" (Nikos Koundouros, 1964) at 9 p.m. in H-110; 50c for students, 75c non-students.

**HILLEL:** Modern dance and mime with Marty Plaine, 7 p.m. at 2130 Bishop.

**FRENCH 201 - SECTION TV:** Channel 9 at 7 and 8:30 a.m., 10:30 p.m.

**BIOLOGY CLUB:** Meeting at 1 p.m. in H-420.

## ISSUES & EVENTS

ISSUES & EVENTS is published weekly by the Information Office of Sir George Williams University. Editorial offices are located in room 211 of the Norris Building, 1435 Drummond Street, Montreal 107 (879-2867). Litho by Journal Offset Inc., 254 Benjamin-Hudon, Ville St. Laurent.

Joel McCormick, editor  
Michael Sheldon  
Malcolm Stone

